

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/821,848 03/29/2001 Toivo T. Kodas 41890-01350 3550 03/18/2003 MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP Suite 411 EXAMINER 3151 S. Vaughn Way TALBOT, BRIAN K Aurora, CO 80014 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1762 DATE MAILED: 03/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · ·	•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	10
	•	09/821,848	KODAS ET AL.	·J
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Brian K Talbot	1762	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addre	SS
	or Reply			
THE - Fyte - afte - If th - If N - Fail - Any	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Persions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period under the provided period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing period patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a r ply within the statutory minimum of thin d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this comm SANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.
3iaius 1)⊡	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24	January 2002		
2a)□		his action is non-final.		
2 <i>a</i>)□ 3)□	Since this application is in condition for allow		tters prosecution as to the r	marite is
,	closed in accordance with the practice unde			ilelits is
· _	tion of Claims			
4)⊡	Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
5) <u> </u>	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊡	Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are rejected.			
7)[_	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
	tion Papers			
	The specification is objected to by the Examin		. –	
10)[_]	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accompanies at a second and a second accompanies at a sec			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.				
	The proposed drawing correction filed on		ilsapproved by the Examiner.	
12\	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re The oath or declaration is objected to by the E			
-		.xammer.		
_	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	an naiceitu undar 25 II C.C.	S 110(a) (d) ar (f)	
13)	·	in priority under 35 0.5.C.	§ 119(a)-(u) or (i).	
a	All b) Some * c) None of:	sta bawa basa sasabisad		
	1. Certified copies of the priority documer		nationation No	
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer			
*	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri- application from the International B See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		зде
14)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	tic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional ap	oplication).
	a) The translation of the foreign language processes The translation of the foreign language processes. The translation is made of a claim for domestic translation in the translation is a second control of the translation in the translation is a second control of the translation in the translation is a second control of the translation of the foreign language processes.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Attachme	nt(s)			
2) 🔲 Noti	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). Informal Patent Application (PTO-1	
Patent and	Trademark Office			

Application/Control Number: 09/821,848

Art Unit: 1762

1. Claims 1-39 remain in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4,7,17,20,27 and 34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claims 4 and 17, the claims are vague and indefinite. It is unclear as to what the term "reacting" includes. Reacting how? By what technique? Clarification is requested.

With respect to claims 7,20,27 and 34, the claims are unclear as to what is encompassed by the term "linear feature".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 09/821,848

Art Unit: 1762

Claims 1,13,26 and 33 are rejected under 35 U S C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Schultz et al. (5,985,356).

Schultz et al. (5,985,356) teaches a process for depositing a plurality of reacted materials upon specific regions of a substrate and analyzing various properties of the deposited materials. The materials may be a variety of material and different compositions. The materials are synthesized and analyzed (see abstract and col. 3, line 10 – col. 4, line 59). A variety of properties can be analyzed (col. 8, lines 39-57). The components are reacted after deposition which includes heating (col. 9, lines 15-25). The screening techniques are various (col. 26, line 52 – col. 29, line 65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-9, 19-22, 27,28 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. (5,985,356).

Schultz et al. (5,985,356) fails to teach the claimed depositing techniques.

While the examiner acknowledges the fact that the prior is silent upon the claimed techniques, it is the Examiner's position that one skilled in the art at the time the invention was

Application/Control Number: 09/821,848

Art Unit: 1762

made would have had a reasonable expectation of achieving similar results regardless of the depositing technique utilized. Furthermore, the prior art disclose numerous techniques which suggest to one skilled in the art that deposition technique is not critical to produce desired results.

Double Patenting

5. Claims 1-39 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5,13-15,18-21,24-27,31,40-43,64-67,75-77,80-83,86-89,93-95,103-105,108-111 and 114-117 of U.S. Patent No. 09/821,723.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 09/821,848

Art Unit: 1762

Page 5

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K Talbot whose telephone number is (703) 305-3775. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6AM-3PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive P Beck can be reached on (703) 308-2333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3775.

Brian K Talbot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1762

BKT March 12, 2003